UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2497th MEETING: 17 NOVEMBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2497) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Cyprus:
Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16147);

Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16150);

Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16151) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2497th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 17 November 1983, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Victor J. GAUCI (Malta).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2497)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Cyprus:
   Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16147);
   Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16150);
   Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16151)

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Cyprus:

Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16147);

Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16150);

Letter dated 15 November 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16151)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Canada, Cyprus, Greece, India, Romania, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Turkey and Yugoslavia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Iacovou (Cyprus), Mr. Haralambopoulos (Greece) and Mr. Kirca (Turkey) took places at the Council table; Mr. Woolcott (Australia), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of all the members of the Council, myself included, I wish to extend a warm welcome to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus and Greece, who have graced us with their presence in the Council chamber and who are prepared to take part in this important debate.

3. The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. As representatives know, we are gathered to discuss a very serious situation, having direct repercussions on the fate of a small island, a Member of the United Nations. Cyprus, unfortunately, still suffers from suspicion and division. Mercifully, thanks to the presence of United Nations forces and to the restraint which they encourage, the island at present is free from the strife and conflict that engulfed it not so long ago. It is of paramount importance that utmost restraint should continue to be exercised by all concerned, both in Cyprus and in neighbouring countries, as well as in this chamber.

4. I would ask all representatives here to join in a sincere effort to enhance the process of reconciliation and peace and to do full justice to the positive potential of the Council in collectively helping to advance our common objective to bring lasting peace to the island, on the basis of previous decisions of the Council, which has already enunciated the relevant considerations. No one would benefit more from reconciliation in Cyprus than all the Cypriot people and Cyprus' immediate neighbours.

5. The Council is meeting today in response to requests contained in letters addressed to the President of the Security Council dated 15 November 1983 from the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland [*S/16147*], the representative of Cyprus [*S/16150*] and the representative of Greece [*S/16151*].

6. Members of the Council have the following documents before them: S/16148, a letter dated 15 November

from the representative of Turkey addressed to the Secretary-General; and the following letters dated 16 November addressed to the President of the Security Council: S/16152, from the representative of Turkey; S/16153, from the representative of France; and S/16155, from the representative of Greece.

7. I now call on the Secretary-General, who wishes to make a statement.

8. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have asked to speak in order to provide Council members with information that they may find relevant to their consideration of the item on the agenda. The matter before the Council concerns the announcement in Nicosia, on 15 November, of the proclamation of a Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and the issuance of a declaration in which that entity is described as an independent State. I was informed about the announcement by a letter dated 15 November, which Mr. Denktaş, the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, handed on that day to my Special Representative, Mr. Gobbi, for transmission to me. The text of that letter, with annexes, has been distributed as a document of the Council [*S/16148, annex*] at the request of the representative of Turkey.

9. Upon receiving Mr. Denktaş's letter, I authorized the United Nations spokesman to issue the following statement on my behalf:

> "The Secretary-General deeply regrets the announcement of a 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'. He considers that this move is contrary to the resolutions of the Security Council on Cyprus and at variance with the high-level agreements of 1977 [*see S/12323, para. 5*] and 1979 [*see S/13369, para. 51*]. It is bound to affect adversely the situation in Cyprus and to complicate the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote an agreed, just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem under the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Security Council. The announcement has been made at the moment when the Special Representative of the Secretary-General has arrived in Cyprus to initiate consultations in preparation for the high-level meeting suggested by Mr. Denktaş with the object of paving the way for a resumption of serious intercommunal negotiations.
>
> "The Secretary-General is in consultation on this serious development with all concerned, including the President of the Security Council. In the mean time, he appeals to all those involved to exercise the utmost restraint and to refrain from any action that may further aggravate the situation."

10. I have little to add to that statement. As the members of the Council are aware, I met in New York with President Kyprianou on 30 September and with Mr. Denktaş on 1 October to discuss the soundings I had initiated in August in order to give effect to my strengthened personal involvement within the framework of the mission of good offices entrusted to me by the Council. Mr. Denktaş at that time suggested that I convene a high-level meeting for the purpose of clarifying the intentions of the two sides for a federal solution and paving the way for a resumption of the inter-communal talks on the existing agreed basis. I promptly transmitted that suggestion to President Kyprianou and discussed it further with him on 6 October. For my part, I made it clear to both leaders that I would be happy to lend my good offices to arrange for a high-level meeting, provided it was well prepared and provided both sides would co-operate in ensuring its success. I felt that a meeting of that kind could provide the opportunity for a firm recommitment by both sides to a peaceful negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem through the inter-communal talks on the existing agreed basis. I also felt that such a recommitment should enable both sides to avoid needless controversy and focus instead on making a serious effort to achieve substantive progress towards a settlement.

11. Having received from my representative encouraging reports on his preliminary contacts with both sides in Nicosia, I decided to initiate consultations on this subject with the parties concerned. Mr. Gobbi arrived in Cyprus on 14 November with my instructions to commence this process on my behalf by consulting both sides on the agenda. It was my hope that arrangements for convening the high-level meeting suggested by Mr. Denktaş could be completed at an early date.

12. Against this background, I must once again express my deep disappointment at last Tuesday's action. However, Mr. Denktaş has informed me that his proposal for a high-level meeting under my auspices remains valid and that my good offices and the negotiations must continue.

13. I wish to emphasize my appeal for restraint. As the members of the Council know, we are fortunate to have the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) stationed in the island. According to UNFICYP reports, access to the north was temporarily stopped prior to the issuance of the Turkish Cypriot announcement on 15 November. The Force Commander, General Greindl, placed the Force on increased vigilance as of 1300 hours. The Turkish checkpoints were reopened shortly thereafter. The situation in the island and along the cease-fire lines supervised by UNFICYP remains calm. By its presence, UNFICYP provides us with a measure of assurance that the current problems will not be allowed to disturb the calm that has prevailed in Cyprus for a number of years.

14. It is evident that the chances of success of our efforts depend primarily on the co-operation of the parties and on their willingness to engage in serious negotiations. Since the beginning of the current crisis, I have been in constant contact with all concerned and with my Special Representative in Nicosia.

15. I am determined to pursue my efforts in order to weather the present crisis and, if possible, induce the parties to return to the search for an agreed, just and lasting settlement. With this end in view, I propose to utilize to the

utmost the presence here at the United Nations of high-ranking representatives of all concerned.

16. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker for this morning is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus, Mr. George Iacovou. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

17. Mr. IACOVOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to report on an escalating act of the continuing Turkish aggression against my country, the purported declaration of independence of that part of Cyprus at present under Turkish occupation.

18. A few years ago, in February and March 1975, the Council was urgently convened [*1813th to 1820th meetings*] to condemn the unilateral Turkish decision of 13 February 1975, which declared that a part of the Republic of Cyprus, the one occupied by the Turkish army, would become a so-called "Federated Turkish State". The Council adopted resolution 367 (1975) condemning that action. It also called upon all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and urgently requested them, as well as the parties concerned, to refrain from any action which might prejudice that sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment, as well as from any attempt at partition of the island.

19. The Council has convened today to consider condemnation, in the strongest terms, of this new Turkish move tantamount to an attempt at the partition of Cyprus, to declare that act null and void, and to call on all Member States not to recognize this nullity.

20. The Turkish leadership, trying to stir up among Turkish Cypriots feelings of hatred and enmity towards their Greek Cypriot compatriots, has not hesitated to repeat, especially in recent months, its favorite but completely unfounded allegations about usurpation of the rights of Turkish Cypriots by the Greek Cypriots and about the "Turkish Cypriots' right to self-determination", trying to create the atmosphere necessary to justify a partitionist policy through secession.

21. Ankara and its agents in Cyprus have been speaking of the Turkish Cypriots' right to self-determination. This right, however, must be exercised by the population of a country as a whole and not by each community separately, for if what Ankara and Denktaş are claiming is applied internationally, many States in the world would be fragmented. Moreover, is it not a contradiction in terms when Ankara and its agents speak of the exercise of this right in the part of the country which is under the absolute control of foreign occupation troops?

22. Recent Turkish attempts to alter the agreed basis and the nature of the intercommunal talks by introducing the notions of "peoples" and "equality" were in essence not referring to the dialogue itself but were, in fact, an attempt to prepare the ground for their unilateral act of 15 November for the secession and for partition of Cyprus.

23. Furthermore, the principle of self-determination is well established in the United Nations, and it certainly cannot be interpreted in such a way as, *inter alia*, to impair the territorial integrity of any State. Would the Turkish Government accept that different communities are entitled to separate self-determination? Would they like us to remind them of the situation in their own country and the implication of such an application of the doctrine there? As regards the "equality" claim, the Cyprus Government believes in the equality of all Cypriots and in the total absence of discrimination of any kind. We accept that each citizen has equal rights and equal opportunities. But to accept that 18 per cent of the population equals the 82 per cent of the population would strike at the roots of democracy and the balance upon which a federal State is to be based.

24. Since the Turkish aggression against my country in July and August 1974 and the continuing occupation of part of its territory by the military forces of Turkey, the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly dealt with the Cyprus problem, and they have both established, through numerous resolutions, the framework for a just and viable solution.

25. These resolutions demand the immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus, considering this as an essential basis for a speedy and mutually acceptable solution of the Cyprus problem. They demand the immediate and effective implementation of resolution 3212 (XXIX), unanimously adopted by the General Assembly on 1 November 1974 and endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974, and of the subsequent Assembly and Council resolutions on Cyprus, which provide the valid and essential basis for the solution of the problem of Cyprus.

26. They deplore the fact that part of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus is still occupied by foreign troops. They deplore all unilateral actions that change the demographic structure of Cyprus by the implantation of settlers from Turkey into the occupied areas or promote *fait accompli*. They express full support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus. They affirm the right of the Republic of Cyprus and its people to full and effective sovereignty and control over the entire territory of Cyprus and its natural and other resources. They call upon all States to support and help the Government of the Republic of Cyprus to exercise these rights and condemn any act which tends to undermine their full and effective exercise.

27. The resolutions deplore the lack of progress in the intercommunal talks and call for meaningful, result-oriented, constructive and substantive negotiations, under the auspices of the Secretary-General, on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the high-level agreements. They call for respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots, including the freedom of movement, the freedom of settlement and the right to property, and the instituting of urgent measures for the voluntary return of the refugees to their homes in safety.

28. They consider that the *de facto* situation created by the force of arms should not be allowed to influence or in any way affect the solution of the problem, and they call upon the parties to refrain from any unilateral action which might adversely affect the prospects of a just and lasting solution of the problem of Cyprus by peaceful means or which violates or is designed to violate the independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. The latest General Assembly resolution, 37/253 of 13 May 1983, welcomed the intention of the Secretary-General to pursue a renewed personal involvement in the quest for a solution of the problem and requested him to undertake such actions or initiatives as he may consider appropriate within the framework of the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Security Council.

29. Of all the provisions of the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus, Turkey has chosen to pay lip service only to the one which refers to negotiations. For many years now the Turkish side has claimed to place the emphasis for the solution of the Cyprus problem on intercommunal talks. Yet they have not given any explanation as to why they refused to attend the talks at the end of May 1983, on the day fixed by the United Nations for their resumption. Similarly, they have given no reason why their various proposals were so separatist and so devoid of substance as to necessitate the intervention of the then Secretary-General to save the talks from total collapse. And over the whole period of intercommunal talks, in contrast to the attitude of the Greek Cypriot side, which was to negotiate meaningfully and in good faith, the Turkish position has been one of delaying tactics and meaningless proposals, thus leading the talks to a virtual impasse, whilst preparing the ground, through a series of unlawful measures, for secession.

30. We must not lose sight of the fact that the presence of the occupation forces over the past nine years constitutes an insurmountable obstacle in the free search for a solution of the Cyprus problem through constructive and meaningful negotiations, as stipulated in the United Nations resolutions and the high-level agreements of 12 February 1977 and 19 May 1979.

31. Every day that has passed, one further step has been taken by Turkey to destroy the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus and to convert the occupied part into a province of Turkey. It was after the visit of the Prime Minister of Turkey, Bulent Ulusu, to the occupied areas of Cyprus in May 1982 that Ankara's decision to establish a so-called Central Bank and a so-called Development Bank in the occupied territory of the Republic was announced. It was after the visit of Denktaş's colleague, Mr. Cagatay, to Ankara last year that Ankara's decision to abolish the Cyprus pound and to introduce the Turkish Lira as "legal tender" in all transactions in the area of the Republic occupied by the Turkish forces was also announced. Furthermore, they proceeded to issue so-called title deeds to the usurpers of the Greek Cypriot properties, including to soldiers from the occupying forces of Turkey and to settlers from Turkey. With these so-called certificates, the usurpers would be able to rent this property, sell it, mortgage it and "distribute it to their children", as the Turkish Cypriot press revealed.

32. The same unacceptable attitude is unfortunately demonstrated by the Turkish side in the purely humanitarian question of missing persons. This issue was discussed at length in the Third Committee at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, and the Cyprus Government position there was thoroughly substantiated by irrefutable evidence. Nine years have elapsed, and we are still trying to trace the fate of more than 1,600 persons missing since the invading forces set foot on Cyprus. In spite of unflagging efforts, in spite of a number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, no progress has been made on this purely humanitarian issue.

33. Furthermore, the occupied areas of Cyprus have been colonized by the importation from Turkey of alien populations, in furtherance of Ankara's plans to change the demographic structure of Cyprus. These colonizers even created a "political party" and its leader, a settler and former Colonel of the Turkish Army, Mr. Ismail Tezer, became a so-called minister in Denktaş's régime. In a press conference on 22 December 1978 he openly declared that the aims of his "party" were to "achieve the partition of Cyprus and its annexation to Turkey". On 17 August 1981 he admitted that the settlers came to Cyprus with the approval of Turkey, that they were presented as an "agricultural force", that almost all of them became citizens of the so-called Turkish Cypriot State and that "their purpose was to stay forever in Cyprus".

34. The objectives of these actions have been deplored by the Turkish Cypriots themselves. The Turkish Cypriot leader and former Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Fazil Küçük, wrote in an article in his newspaper *Halkin Sesi* on 24 May 1978 that these settlers "turned this paradise island into hell".

35. As regards Ankara's sinister plans against Cyprus, they are becoming more and more manifest every day. Its plans are to wipe out any trace of Greek Cypriot rights in the occupied part of Cyprus, to partition the island and to annex, *de facto*, the occupied territories of Cyprus, thus satisfying for the present its geopolitical objectives. All its illegal and inhuman actions and tactics are motivated by this overall objective, and its deeds speak louder than its words. We submit a few of the many provocative and secessionist statements made 20 years ago by Turkish officials against Cyprus' independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. Mr. Kemal Satir, former Vice-President of Turkey, in a public statement in 1964, said, "Cyprus will be divided into two sections, one of which will join Turkey." Hardly a few months later, in September 1964, the former Prime Minister of Turkey, Ismet Inonou, addressing the Turkish National Assembly, said, with reference to the Geneva talks of that year, "Officially we promote the federation concept rather than the partition thesis so as to remain within the provisions of the Treaty." This is another clear indication of the tactical nature of the use of federation as an official camouflage for partition.

36. That the ulterior aim of partition is annexation transpires from the newspaper *Halkin Sesi*,—the mouthpiece of Mr. Küçük, then Vice-President of the Republic of Cyprus—which in its editorial of 9 August 1965 wrote:

> "Cyprus is nother Alexandretta in the history of Turkey. The power of Turkey will ensure an honourable life for the Turkish Cypriots in the same way as it did in Alexandretta by annexing it and bringing it under Turkish domination. The road in this direction has been opened by the Turkish fighters at Kokkina, who are now fighting in every corner of Cyprus."

37. Furthermore, in a recent long interview in the Turkish paper *Tercuman* of 30 July 1983, Mr. Melih Esenbel, former Secretary-General of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, former Turkish Foreign Minister and former Turkish Ambassador to Washington, who played a role in the Zurich and London Agreements,[1] revealed Turkey's real intentions towards Cyprus, admitting that behind its partitionist designs on Cyprus were its own strategic considerations.

38. Mr. Esenbel explained how Turkey, which had abandoned every claim on Cyprus in 1923, became party to the Cyprus problem with enormous and patient work. He further stated that Turkey accepted only those proposals which were leaving the door open to separate self-determination and partition and subsequently rejected all those proposals, including one by the then Governor of Cyprus, Sir Hugh Foot, when they realized that "the road leading to *taqsim*"—partition—was closed. They accepted Macmillan's plan only when they were given assurances that "the right to self-determination will be used" and thus the road to *taqsim* too would be opened. He also revealed that Turkey's Prime Minister Menderes gave them instructions in Zurich "to find a formula which will ensure the possibilities of Turkey's security", because "it is becoming obvious that at this stage we will not be able to achieve *taqsim*". Mr. Esenbel further stated that "according to the *de facto* situation, it is clear on the territory itself and not on paper as to how the Cyprus problem will be solved".

39. On 20 July 1980—the sixth anniversary of the invasion—Mr. Turan Günes, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey at the time of the invasion, openly declared that "Cyprus is valuable as a right arm for a country interested in its defence or for its expansionist aims". Mr. Günes took it a step further and admitted that "many States to a certain extent, because it suits their interests, want to see the Cyprus problem as our desire to protect the Turkish community on the island, whereas the actual problem is the security of the 45 million Turks in the motherland".

40. The Turkish Cypriot population, which is also suffering under the Turkish military occupation, has many times voiced its concern over the separatist and partitionist attitude of the Turkish side. Indicative of that concern is a recent statement made by Mr. Orhan Kahya, leader of the Turkish Cypriots who crossed to the occupied areas of Cyprus in 1975, as published in the Turkish Cypriot magazine, *Olay*, on 8 March 1982. He said: "Presently even the Turkish Cypriot women are exerting efforts to go to their properties in the south and the women are being prevented from doing so". He added: "The reason why the people insist on going to the south is that they have properties there...; now they live in misery in the north".

41. Let the world not be misled by false allegations by the Turkish side that before the invasion the Turkish Cypriots were suffering or that they were forced out of the Government. The leader of the Turkish Cypriot Trade Union, DEV-IS, Mr. Hasan Sarica, refuted that allegation when he stated that:

> "In the pre-1974 era, the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots worked together in a brotherly manner and the economic position of the Turkish workers was excellent.... After 1974 the economic position of the Turkish Cypriot workers substantially deteriorated.... In pre-1974 Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots worked together and shared the same economic profits. The conditions of life of the Turkish Cypriots changed after 1974."

That statement was published in the newspaper of Denktaş's régime, *Birlik*, on 30 August 1980.

42. It is not true that the Turkish Cypriots were "forced out of the Government". What is true is that the Turkish Cypriot ministers refused from 1964 on to participate in the Council of Ministers in order to show that, as the then Vice-President, Mr. Küçük, put it, "the Republic was dead" and to promote partition. The agenda of the Council of Ministers continued to be sent to Turkish Cypriot ministers at least one year after they chose not to participate, but they insisted in their refusal. The Turkish Cypriot judges remained in their posts until 1966, but they were then forced, under threats of imprisonment by the Turkish leadership, to withdraw, and they acted accordingly. Many Turkish Cypriots in the diplomatic service of the Republic remained in their posts until 1974, just as many Turkish Cypriots who served in the diplomatic missions chose to remain in their positions.

43. Ample evidence of Ankara's policies of segregation and partition is provided by the regular biannual reports of the late Secretary-General U Thant, which demolish the allegations and irrefutably show the falseness of the accusation of mistreatment of the Turkish Cypriot community by the Cyprus Government.

44. As regards the so-called population exchange agreement, which the Turkish side presents as a reason for not complying with the agreements of 12 February 1977 and 19 May 1979 and for the declaration of their "independence", it would be ironic indeed for anyone to allege that the 200,000 Greek Cypriot refugees came to the free areas of the Republic voluntarily. It was the threat of massacre, rape and torture; it was the cruelty of the Turkish forces of invasion; and it was fear of the Turkish tanks and the Turkish bayonets that forced one third of the Cyprus population to abandon their ancestral homes and properties and run to the free areas of the Republic of save their lives.

45. How could the agreement of 2 August 1975 [*see S/11789, annex*] be described as a "population exchange agreement", when in paragraph 2 it was stated:

"Mr. Denktaş reaffirmed, and it is agreed, that the Greek Cypriots at present in the north of the island are free to stay and that they will be given every help to lead a normal life, including facilities for education and for the practice of their religion, as well as medical care by their own doctors and freedom of movement in the north"?

How could that agreement be defined as a "population exchange agreement" when, in paragraph 5, it was stipulated:

"In connexion with the implementation of the above agreement, priority will be given to the reunification of families, which may also involve the transfer of a number of Greek Cypriots, at present in the south, to the north"?

In paragraph 4, it also provided that "The United Nations will have free and normal access to Greek Cypriot villages and habitations in the north".

46. What was the outcome of that agreement? The Turkish side immediately violated each and every one of its provisions. A mere look at the periodic reports of the Secretary-General on the question of Cyprus will convince everyone of how the Turkish leadership honours its signature. The Greek Cypriots enclaved in the occupied area were forced to leave their homes to join the other Greek Cypriot refugees in the free areas of the Republic. Instead of their being given help to lead a normal life, their situation became miserable. Their education was hampered and so was the practice of their religion; no medical care by their own doctors was allowed and their freedom of movement was hindered.

47. As regards the freedom of movement of UNFICYP in the occupied areas, for nine years now there appears in every biannual report of the Secretary-General a special paragraph devoted to that restriction by the Turkish army. Furthermore, what can we say about paragraph 5 of that agreement, which speaks about the reunification of families of Greek Cypriots and returning them to their ancestral homes in the occupied areas? Not even one such person has been allowed to return. What can we say to Ankara or to its obedient instruments in the occupied area who dare to say: "to speak about the return of refugees to their homes is nothing but a ploy by the Greek Cypriots, meaning that they do not want an agreement"? That arrogant statement came from the mouth of Mr. Atakol, a colleague of Mr. Denktaş, and I present it to the Council as it appeared in the newspaper of Mr. Denktaş, *Birlik*, on 9 October 1982.

48. As regards the so-called economic embargo propaganda of the Turkish side, it is clear that the economic hardships experienced by the Turkish Cypriots are the direct result of the invasion and the occupation and not the legal actions and the obligation of the Cyprus Government to protect, through legal means, the rights of its citizens, whose properties were usurped by the invaders and the settlers transported from Anatolia. The "embargo" allegation is so misleading that even in the minds of the Turkish Cypriots themselves it cannot be substantiated. In the Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Kurtulus* of 7 November 1980 it was published that the arguments put forward by Mr. Denktaş "attributing this misery to the... alleged Greek Cypriot embargo are not true". The Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Veziroglu, said, and this was published in the Turkish Cypriot newspaper, *Oncu*:

"The Denktaş-National Unity Party régime has tried to load the blame for all their mistakes, exploitations and lack of success onto the Greeks... On important issues there is no Greek embargo which affects us."

A most recent article on that allegation appeared in the Turkish Cypriot newspaper, *Yeniduzen*, of 21 September 1982:

"To tell the truth no one can convince us that the embargo is the reason for the economic bottlenecks in our area. Most of the economic troubles spring from the type of relations existing between the TFSC"—the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus—"and Turkey.... As long as this régime does not act within the framework of the summit agreements in Cyprus, the situation will not change".

49. Turkey continues to exercise actual and exclusive authority over the occupied areas of Cyprus seized during the invasion by Turkish troops in July and August 1974. It keeps the occupied area under its control through the maintenance of a large force of about 35,000 troops, with about 150 tanks and 80 armoured vehicles. The Turkish troops in the occupied area consist of two regular divisions with all auxiliary units, plus special parachute, commando, air and naval units. They are spread throughout the area in military camps. Columns of Turkish troops constantly patrol the occupied territory and maintain checkpoints on main lines of communication in the same area. The Turkish army is not under the jurisdiction of the so-called TFSC, not even under the jurisdiction of the so-called courts of the TFSC.

50. It is worth mentioning that the Turkish army directly intervenes in matters in the occupied areas, as it did, for example, in strike-breaking and in the seizure, without any prior consultation with the Turkish Cypriot leadership, of 32 Maronite houses in the villages of Asomatos, Karpasia and Kormakiti for Turkish army officers' families in July 1982. The Turkish army has also displaced Turkish Cypriots from their properties in the north. That is stated in the *Press Digest from the North*, quoting *Birlik* of 18 January 1983.

51. The occupied area is so saturated by Turkish troops that the proportion is one soldier for every four members of the population, including women and children. If one takes into account also the 35,000 settlers from Turkey, then the proportion is two Turks from Turkey for every four members of the Turkish Cypriot community. It is thus impossible for any independent action to be taken by the Turkish Cypriot leadership. That leadership in fact expresses the will and policy of Turkey.

52. The Turkish Government, via General Evren, has told Turkish Cypriot political leaders that it claims the

right to intervene directly in Cyprus, it being the responsibility of the Turkish armed forces "to protect the interests and rights of the Turkish nation and that the Turkish armed forces have the right to use this authority everywhere they serve, including Cyprus". That is quoted from *Olay* of 23 August 1982.

53. Furthermore, the so-called Turkish Cypriot Cabinet meetings are attended by a representative of the Turkish occupation force in Cyprus, who gives the final shape to any decision taken by that illegal body. It is worth mentioning that the European Commission of Human Rights has held that sole control over the Turkish occupying forces is vested in the Government of Turkey and that their presence in the occupied area engages Turkey's international responsibility in respect of all persons or property over which they exercise control. That is stated in the report of the Commission in the case of Cyprus v. Turkey, 10 July 1976, page 32; in the decision of 10 July 1978 on the admissibility of Application No. 8007/77; and in the report on Application No. 8007/77, paragraphs 21 and 22.

54. The so-called Turkish Cypriot Security Forces are under the authority and subject to the orders of the General Staff of the Turkish Army, and all expenses for these "Security Forces" are provided by Turkey. Furthermore, the so-called Turkish Cypriot Administration and "Turkish Cypriot Federated State" are subject to the authority and directions of the Turkish Government. They are the products of Turkey's military occupation. They exist only by virtue of the presence of the Turkish forces, which prevent the Government of the Republic of Cyprus from reasserting the Republic's jurisdiction. Any alleged authority exercised by that illegal body is in actual fact derived from the strength of the Turkish Army, to which it is subordinate.

55. That it is Turkey which will take decisions on the solution of the problem and on what concessions will be made in any settlement has been repeatedly stated by Turkish Prime Ministers, such as Mr. Demirel and Mr. Ecevit. Particularly clear examples of statements showing this come from speeches in 1977 by the Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Erbakan, who, for example, said in April 1977:

> "Cyprus belongs to Turkey and the Greek Cypriots must be content with what Turkish generosity has allowed... there is no chance of ceding an inch in Cyprus... there can be no question of return of Greek Cypriots to their homes... Famagusta and Varosha belong to us. We do not concede an inch, not even one window of a house. Morphou and the surrounding villages belong to us, we do not give back [anything]."

56. Another glaring example is the statement made by Mr. Denktaş himself, published in the Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Yeniduzen* on 5 October 1982, in which he stated: "Whether I believe it or not, whether I consider it right or not, I do whatever Turkey says". Furthermore, another Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Veziroglu, in a statement published in *Halkin Sesi* of 6 November 1983, accused Denktaş, saying that "a leader who acts like the public servant of Turkey cannot reside in Nicosia but should reside in Ankara". Although Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership are usually careful not openly to acknowledge Turkey's responsibility in the occupied areas of Cyprus, there are politicians who among themselves sometimes pierce the veil and reveal the reality of Turkish control. Evidence in the form of Turkish and Turkish Cypriot newspaper reports shows this reality. Particularly illuminating are articles showing Turkish awareness of the need to obscure Turkish control—see *Milliyet* of 16 June 1982 and *Gunaydin* of 2 November 1982.

57. The major administrative mechanism for Turkish control of the occupied area of Cyprus is by way of the Cyprus Co-ordination Council, previously the Cyprus Affairs Co-ordination Council, now composed of the Turkish Prime Minister, two Deputy Prime Ministers, the Foreign Minister of Turkey, the National Forces Minister of Turkey, the Finance Minister of Turkey, the Industry and Technology Minister of Turkey, the Trade Minister of Turkey, the Construction Minister of Turkey, the Communications Minister of Turkey and the Agriculture and National Resources Minister of Turkey. In addition, each Turkish ministry has a Cyprus Affairs Bureau, while there is a Cyprus Affairs Secretariat in the office of the Turkish Prime Minister, chaired by Mr. Guneri, formerly the Turkish General Officer commanding the Turkish army in Cyprus.

58. There are in the occupied areas large numbers of Turkish civil servants who implement the Cyprus Co-ordination Council's decisions for those areas. The Council takes all economic and social decisions for the occupied part of Cyprus and implements them. This information is derived from Turkish and Turkish Cypriot newspapers such as *Cumhuriyet* of 25 October 1981, *Birlik* of 25 November 1981 and *Hurriyet* of 1 December 1981.

59. Decisions for the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus are taken in Ankara by the Cyprus Co-ordination Council and are then sent to the "TFSC" for final approval, and are thereafter ultimately approved, again by the Cyprus Co-ordination Council in Ankara, and put into effect by that Council. That information was obtained from *Kibris Postasi* of 13 November 1982.

60. The so-called Turkish Ambassador to Cyprus also exercises direct authority in Cyprus, intervening in the decisions of the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus—see *Cumhuriyet* of 22 December 1982; interview with Denktaş as to the "Turkish Ambassador's" intervention.

61. Mr. Denktaş has openly admitted that Turkey has control over the affairs of the occupied areas—in the magazine *Olay* of 19 July 1982 and in the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* of 20 December 1982—a view supported by the Turkish Cypriot opposition leaders who have disclosed Turkey's pressures and interference and its disregard for the so-called TFSC Constitution.

62. As regards Turkey's complete financial and political control over the occupied area of Cyprus, this is evidenced by the following. It approves the "TFSC" budget in

Ankara and determines the salaries of the so-called TFSC civil servants. President Evren forced Turkish Cypriot politicians to vote for the "TFSC" budget. As they revealed, having been warned by President Evren, they did not wish to give cause for intervention by the Turkish army. Turkey provides two thirds of the budget of the occupied area. Turkey set up a joint working group under General Guneri, Turkish Chairman of the Cyprus Affairs Secretariat, to prepare an action plan to give direction to the economy of the occupied part of Cyprus, which package was presented to the Turkish Cypriot so-called Cabinet by the Turkish Prime Minister, Mr. Ulusu. Turkey controls the currency of the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus, the Turkish lira being the currency in circulation after the abolition of the Cyprus pound as legal tender, and the State-controlled Agricultural Bank of Turkey acts as the Central Bank for the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus.

63. The Turkish Tourist Minister has stated, "We do not see the TFSC as a separate country. As part of my duty I visited Cyprus at least 50 times." He also said he thought Turkey's proposed Tourism Encouragement Law would also be enacted to cover the occupied areas.

64. Enver Emin, Secretary-General of Mr. Denktaş's National Unity Party, warned that "TFSC politicians could annihilate us within 24 hours" and that "the TFSC economy stands on its feet only with the assistance provided by Turkey".

65. The formation and composition of the so-called Government of the "TFSC" is in effect shaped by Turkey. Coalition-making over the last two years, as described in the Turkish press, has occurred in accordance with Turkey's dictates. Furthermore decision-making in the occupied areas is under Turkish surveillance and control, and this is evident from the mere fact that three officials from Turkey attend the "TFSC Cabinet" meetings, including the Turkish Ambassador and the head of the security forces.

66. As regards the declaration of a so-called Turkish Cypriot State and Turkey's responsibilities in and absolu. control over the entire occupied territory of Cyprus, most revealing is Mr. Denktaş's recent complaint that recognition of and independence for the so-called TFSC can be sought only "with the approval of Turkey or when Turkey too feels this is necessary". I quote from *Birlik* of 12 February 1983. Mr. Denktaş, commenting on Turkey's control of any such decision, said recently:

> "In the past, even before I pronounced the word [independence], the Turkish Government would choke the word in my mouth. At least this time I am thankful that no such thing was done".

I am quoting from *Milliyet* of 29 May 1983. The leading Turkish newspaper, *Cumhuriyet*, on 18 June 1983 stated that the resolution of self-determination was passed only after Turkish consent.

67. It is evident from the foregoing that, in view of the massive presence of the Turkish army and the total dependence of the occupied area on Turkey, the so-called Turkish Federated State of Cyprus is in reality a puppet wholly controlled by Turkey, and the declaration of the so-called North Cyprus Turkish Republic was adopted with the full knowledge, encouragement and support of Turkey. The recognition of that non-existent State, extended on the same date by the Turkish Government, is indicative of Turkey's involvement and complicity.

68. One of the arguments put forward by the Turkish side was that the internationalization of the Cyprus problem was harming the climate of the intercommunal talks and that that was the main reason for the lack of progress. The Cyprus Government, although it had reservations, decided to put that argument to the test. For three consecutive years it avoided any recourse to the United Nations on the problem of Cyprus, thus demonstrating once again its good will and genuine desire that there be some progress in the intercommunal dialogue. Unfortunately, not only did the deadlock remain but also, through its organs in the occupied area, Ankara took advantage of the time gained to consolidate the *de facto* situation there and to apply new secessionist measures.

69. What is currently one of the main issues, and what this body is legitimately entitled to be informed about, is the Turkish attitude regarding the personal involvement and initiative of the Secretary-General, approved and supported by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations, as expressed in General Assembly resolution 37/253 of 13 May 1983 on Cyprus.

70. Beginning from their meeting at New Delhi in February this year, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, expressed to the Secretary-General his grave concern and disappointment at the lack of progress in the intercommunal talks and encouraged the Secretary-General to proceed with a new approach, through a personal involvement in the quest for a just and viable solution. President Kyprianou and the Secretary-General met again in Paris a few months later and an exchange of views took place.

71. As the Council well knows, the Secretary-General submitted to the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot sides an informal document containing soundings, as part of his personal initiative, and President Kyprianou and Mr. Denktaş were invited to New York for separate consultations with him. President Kyprianou met the Secretary-General on 14 September, and our response was submitted on 30 September, as requested by him. During that meeting we officially informed him that his personal involvement was welcomed and accepted and that the methodology he proposed was also accepted. We furthermore submitted our response to his soundings in a most constructive manner, and we are very pleased that he himself has, both publicly and privately, described our response "as a positive and constructive step".

72. The Turkish attitude was from the beginning negative. The Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktaş, postponed

his meeting with the Secretary-General from 16 September to several other days in September, and finally to 28 September. Eventually the meeting took place on 1 October—one day past the time limit. That was the manner chosen by Mr. Denktaş to show the Secretary-General that the meeting was outside the framework of his initiative. Mr. Denktaş rejected the initiative outright, stating to the Secretary-General that he disagreed *in toto* with the methodology and that consequently there was no reason for him to submit any comments on the soundings. Continuing his repeated practice of engaging in what could be described as diversionary tactics, as a way of deflecting attention from the main issue, which is the Secretary-General's initiative, and with the aim apparently of neutralizing it, Mr. Denktaş—to, I believe, everybody's surprise, including the Secretary-General's—made a spectacular proposal to meet with President Kyprianou. It is regrettable that the Turkish Cypriot leader proceeded to connect threats and ultimatums to his proposal. Arriving in Strasbourg from New York, where he met the press, Mr. Denktaş set a three-week time limit for the convening of the meeting with President Kyprianou; otherwise, he threatened to declare a "separate State".

73. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus reacted very firmly in the diplomatic field in all directions to those unacceptable secessionist actions and declared that even a so-called change of name of Mr. Denktaş's fictitious State to "North Cyprus Republic" would be considered by the Cyprus Government as a move equivalent to secession and that we were ready to react appropriately.

74. After Mr. Denktaş's proposal, the Secretary-General held consultations with President Kyprianou. It was understood that Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar was thinking of convening such a meeting only under the usual requirements for the convening of meetings of this kind. These requirements are basic elements for the preparation of such meetings. In the case of Cyprus they were crucial, owing to the fact that a possible failure would have undesirable reprecussions. The requirements are: an agenda to be agreed by the two parties, proper preparation of the meeting and good chances for a successful outcome.

75. Having received the relevant assurances from the Secretary-General, the Cyprus Government agreed to the commencement of consultations for the possible convening of such a meeting.

76. At a time when our side accepted the initiative of the Secretary-General, at a time when the Turkish side blatantly rejected it and at a time when consultations were in progress regarding Mr. Denktaş's own proposal to meet with President Kyprianou, an unwarranted and arbitrary secessionist act was taking place in the occupied areas of the Republic of Cyprus.

77. On 15 November 1983 the so-called "Assembly of the Turkish Federated State of Kibris" purported to declare an independent "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" in the territory of the Republic occupied by the military forces of Turkey, thereby attempting to secede and to destroy the territorial integrity and unity of Cyprus, a State Member of the United Nations.

78. The situation purportedly created is the direct result of the massive use of force by Turkey in 1974 and the consequent military occupation of 37 per cent of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus. The actions of Turkey in 1974 and since then, to this very day, have been contrary to the fundamental principles of the prohibition of the use of force and the sovereign equality and the territorial integrity of States. Situations resulting from invasion and occupation should not and could not be recognized by States, as this would be in breach of the principle prohibiting recognition of situations brought about by the illegal threat or use of force.

79. In sum, all the Turkish actions fall squarely within the definition of aggression adopted by the General Assembly in 1974. As the Government of the Republic firmly declared, such illegal activities are also contrary to the numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, to the Charter of the United Nations to the international treaties registered with the United Nations and to the peremptory norms of international law.

80. Mr. Denktaş's so-called "Government" and "State" are merely a puppet régime and a puppet entity enjoying whatever degree of effectiveness they possess by virtue of the facts of Turkey's military support and massive financial assistance. In reality Denktaş régime is both maintained and controlled by Turkey and is similar to Manchukuo and to Slovakia and Croatia during the Second World War. Any entity created as a consequence of Turkey's aggression and its fomenting of secession is a nullity. For Turkey to support the Denktaş régime or to tolerate a purported secession is a gross violation of the Final Act of Helsinki. The fruits of aggression and Turkey's breaches of treaties and international law cannot be recognized. Principle IV of the Final Act of Helsinki expressly provides: "No such occupation or acquisition will be recognized as legal."

81. The area of the purported entity continues to be an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, although it is currently under the belligerent occupation of Turkey, which is in breach of its obligations under article II of the Treaty of Guarantee[2] of 1960, whereby Turkey undertook to guarantee the "territorial integrity ... of the Republic" and "the state of affairs established by the Basic Articles of its Constitution", in particular of Article 185, which provides that "the territory of the Republic is one and indivisible and excludes separate independence". Turkey is also in breach of that part of the same article which prohibits "any activity aimed at promoting, directly or indirectly ... partition of the Island".

82. The Turkish Government immediately announced that it recognized the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. By supporting the continuance of the Denktaş régime and the purported secession, Turkey, as I have said, is contravening the Treaty concerning the Establishment of the Republic of Cyprus[3] and the Tready of Guarantee.

83. As the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, has declared, the purported proclamation of independence and secession of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus involves international aggression, direct and indirect, attacks on the territorial integrity, sovereignty and unity of the Republic of Cyprus, a violation of frontiers and interference in its domestic jurisdiction. The action constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security and creates a most explosive situation in the whole of the eastern Mediterranean area.

84. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus is seeking the assistance of the international community in helping the Republic of Cyprus, both in the United Nations and in all other forums, to demand of the Government of Turkey that it take all required measures for the reversal of the unilateral act and that it rescind its recognition of the purported régime.

85. This arbitrary and provocative behaviour and the contemptuous disregard shown by Turkey should be a source of serious concern to the Council, because the situation in Cyprus and its implications, extending beyond the confines of our country and beyond the suffering of its people, endanger international peace and security and at the same time constitute a serious challenge to the effectiveness of the United Nations.

86. My Government, therefore, appeals to the Security Council urgently to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter and to adopt such effective measures as are warranted by the situation, measures which will reverse the unacceptable situation created in the occupied part of Cyprus. We trust furthermore that the Council will give serious consideration to the taking of effective and urgent measures for the implementation of its own mandatory resolutions, in accordance with the Charter and with the Council's own responsibilities and self-respect.

87. I wish to conclude my statement with the following declaration.

88. On 15 November 1983, the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community in the Republic of Cyprus made a statement by which he purported to declare the independence of an entity described as the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus". The Government of the Republic of Cyprus regards that declaration as a nullity. All States are under the duty and have the obligation not to recognize any Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus. Turkey is solely responsible for the purported declaration of independence, which would have been impossible had Turkey not been in occupation of that part of the territory of the Republic.

89. Given the political and military control which Turkey exercises in the occupied part of Cyprus—which obviously, in the circumstances, is not independent of Turkey—one arrives at the inescapable conclusion that political, legal and moral responsibility for events in the occupied part of Cyprus lies with the Government of Turkey and will do so until such time as the authority of the Republic is restored in the whole of Cyprus.

90. Accordingly, Turkey is responsible for the breaches of the Treaty of Guarantee and the Treaty concerning the Establishment of the Republic resulting from these latest threats to, *inter alia*, the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, which has been dealt another serious blow. Thus, Turkey is under the obligation to reverse this situation and to restore the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus.

91. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, Mr. Yannis Haralambopoulos. I invite him to make his statement.

92. Mr. HARALAMBOPOULOS (Greece): Since this is the first time I am addressing the Council during your presidency, Sir, I should like to express my confidence that under your experienced guidance the Council will discuss the matter on its agenda in a manner which will help peace and justice.

93. Once again, as it has been doing for the past eight years, the Turkish side has flagrantly violated international treaties and has trampled upon fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I am referring to the criminal act of the purported declaration of independence of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

94. In 1974, in violation of all norms of international law, the Turkish army invaded the Republic of Cyprus. Since then Turkey has continued to impose its military occupation on a great part of the territory of the Republic, in spite of repeated resolutions of the United Nations calling, in the words of the most recent one, for the immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus. For all practical purposes, the northern part of the Republic of Cyprus is totally controlled by Turkey through its army of occupation.

95. It now appears that the already unacceptable state of affairs was not enough for Turkey. Continuing his policies of disregard for international law and morality, Turkey's puppet, Mr. Denktaş, has proceeded to the purported declaration of independence of a so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the territory of the Republic of Cyprus occupied by Turkey. Mr. Denktaş chose to do this at the very moment when the representative of the Secretary-General was in Cyprus in order to deliver to him the latest proposal of Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar aimed at furthering the personal involvement of the Secretary-General with a view to achieving a negotiated solution to the problem of Cyprus.

96. The decision which purports to declare the independence of a so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus falls within the context of the continued violation of the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus by Turkey. More particularly, it is in itself an undeniable breach of the Treaty of Guarantee[2] signed by Turkey along with Greece and the United Kingdom in 1960, whereby Turkey undertook to guarantee the territorial integrity and security of the Republic of Cyprus and the state of affairs established by the Basic Articles of its Constitution. Article 185 of that

Constitution expressly excludes separatist independence and provides that the territory of the Republic is one and indivisible.

97. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus has just presented the Security Council with a clear and detailed analysis of the recent developments in the Republic of Cyprus. I do not wish to impose on the time of the Council's members by touching again on the history of the question or its legal aspects. Besides, representatives in the Council and their Governments know perfectly well that Turkey has been violating international law continuously in Cyprus, and they know equally well that the so-called declaration of independence of the pseudo-Turkish Cypriot State is just another act in the interminable drama of the occupation of part of the Republic of Cyprus by the Turkish army. It should not be forgotten that the brutal activities of Turkey in the island have only been made possible by its military power. This brutal fact should be borne in mind by the Council and particularly by the countries who help maintain Turkey's military apparatus.

98. Greece, because it is linked to Cyprus by special relations and is one of the guarantors of its sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity, will spare no efforts in order to see the end of Turkey's illegal acts against the Republic of Cyprus, as well as the restoration of the Republic's unity in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

99. We call upon all Members of the Organization not only to refrain from affording any form of recognition to this artificial product of illegality and brute force which calls itself the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, but also to join in unequivocal condemnation of this illegal act. Moreover, we call upon Turkey, whose invasion and continued military occupation of the northern part of the island have created the conditions for such a declaration, immediately to withdraw its army from the Republic of Cyprus. Turkey has the sole responsibility for whatever happens in the northern part of Cyprus because its army of occupation, for all practical purposes, is the sole source of authority in the occupied area.

100. It should be stressed that the continued presence of the Turkish forces in Cyprus re-enforcing Turkey's expansionist aims and illegal actions, compounded by the recent developments which we are here to discuss, run the great risk of creating a highly explosive situation in an area in which international conflicts already abound, thus posing once more a grave threat to international peace and security.

101. Greece declares its intention not to recognize, in the present or in the future, this arbitrary and provocative Turkish act. Greece will continue to pursue its efforts for the re-establishment of freedom and legality in the sovereign Republic of Cyprus with all the means at its disposal.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Conference on Cyprus: Documents signed and initialled at Lancaster House on 19 February 1959*, Cmnd. 679 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1959).

[2] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 382, No. 5475.

[3] *Ibid.*, No. 5476.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—August 1992—2,050